



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,994	03/22/2004	Ari Juhani Peltola	872.0145.U1(US)	1211
29683	7590	07/14/2006	EXAMINER	
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP 4 RESEARCH DRIVE SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			CHOW, CHARLES CHIANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	
DATE MAILED: 07/14/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/805,994

Applicant(s)

PELTOLA, ARI JUHANI

Examiner

Charles Chow

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7, 10, 13-14 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8, 9, 11 and 12 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1. The office action is for amendment received on 5/5/2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. (US 003/0072,278) in view of Suzuki et al. (US 2003/0014,705 A1)

For claim 1, Wu et al. (Wu) teaches a method to operate user equipment 114 in a site selection diversity transmit mode [Fig. 1, paragraph 0002, 0013-0014].

Wu fails to teach the detecting a case where no base station is transmitting to the user equipment UE, the inserting predetermined values into an output of a UE receiver, and decoding the predetermined values.

Suzuki et al. (Suzuki) teaches these features [the detecting of packet loss in 802, Fig. 6, for the no response from transmitting station, base station, in abstract; the inserting of "00", 8053, at the output 206 of system receiver decoder 205, due to packet loss in the receiving signal, Fig. 16, abstract, paragraph 0078]; the decoding the predetermined values [the application decoder 209 for decoding the inserted predetermined value, to detect transmission error [Fig. 17, abstract], in order to prevent the synchronization problem in decoder, for detecting transmission error. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wu with Suzuki's inserting of "00" at the receiver output, system decoder 205, in order to prevent error in the decoder.

Art Unit: 2618

For claims 2, 4, Suzuki teaches the predetermined values correspond to zero bits [the “00” predetermined values is inserted for 8053, Fig. 16].

Regarding **claim 3,** Wu teaches the user equipment operable in a SSDT mode [paragraph 0002, 0013-0014].

Wu fails to teach the detecting a case where no base station is transmitting to UE, inserting predetermined values into an output of a UE.

Suzuki teaches the means [802] for detecting a case where no base station is transmitting to the UE [Fig. 6, the detection of transmission loss for no response from transmitting station, base station, abstract];

means [205, Fig. 16-17] for inserting predetermined values into an output of a UE [means 205 for inserting “00 in Fig. 16; means 206 output of system receiver decoder 205, Fig. 16, abstract, paragraph 0078];

means for decoding the predetermined values [means application decoder 209 for decoding inserted “00”, Fig. 17, abstract], in order to prevent the synchronization problem in decoder, for detecting transmission error. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wu with Suzuki’s inserting of “00”at the receiver output, system decoder 205, in order to prevent the error the decoder.

For claim 8, WU teaches a computer program product embodied on a computer readable medium execution of which operates UE in a SSDT mode [the software readable procedure 200 executes on access terminal 114 for the SSDT, paragraph 0026, Fig. 4-8]. Wu fails to teach the detecting a case where no base station is transmitting to UE, inserting predetermined values into an output of a UE.

Art Unit: 2618

Suzuki teaches the operation of detecting a case where no base station is transmitting to the UE [Fig. 6, the detection of transmission loss for no response from transmitting station, base station, abstract]; inserting predetermined values into an output of a UE receiver [the 205 for inserting "00 in Fig. 16; at the 206 at the system receiver decoder output, Fig. 16, paragraph 0078];

decoding the predetermined values [209 for decoding inserted "00", Fig. 17, abstract], in order to prevent the synchronization problem in decoder, for detecting transmission error. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wu with Suzuki's inserting of "00" at the receiver output, system decoder 205, in order to prevent the error in the decoder.

For claims 9, 12, Suzuki teaches the predetermined values correspond to zero bits [the "00" predetermined values is inserted for 8053, Fig. 16].

Regarding claim 11, Wu teaches an integrated circuit installable in UE that is operable in a SSDT mode [the application specific integrated circuit ASIC for the SSTT, paragraph 0072]. Wu fails to teaches the circuitry responsive to a condition where no base station is transmitting to the UE, the insert predetermined values into an output of a UE receiver.

Suzuki teaches the circuitry responsive to a condition where no base station is transmitting to the UE [the circuitry 802 for detecting packet loss for no response from base station];

insert predetermined values into an output of a UE receiver [the 205 for inserting "00 in Fig. 16; at the 206 at the system receiver decoder output, Fig. 16, paragraph 0078] and circuitry to decode the predetermined values [circuitry 209 for decoding inserted "00", Fig. 17, abstract], in order to prevent the synchronization

Art Unit: 2618

problem in decoder, for detecting transmission error. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wu with Suzuki's inserting of "00" at the receiver output, system decoder 205, in order to prevent the error in decoder.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Claims 5-7, 10, 13-14 are allowable in the previous mailed office action, and the reason for allowable is included in below.

Applicant has shown that reference **Toskala et al. (2003/0219,037 A1)** belongs to Assignee, **Nokia Corporation** (page 7 of applicant's amendment).

Claims 5-7, 10, 13-14 are allowable over the prior art of record, the prior art fails to teach singly, particularly, or in combination, the subject matter, for the **in response to detecting a case where selected primary cell fails to transmit a downlink dedicated physical channel DPCH to the UE, inserting predetermined sample values into the output of a UE receiver prior to a UE channel decoder; and decoding the predetermined sample values as zero bit so as to maintain proper channel decoder operation, for the site selection diversity transmit, to prevent the situation when there is no response in the messages for the requesting of a communication channel from base stations in the downlink physical channel DPCH, to the mobile station,** as shown in independent claims 5, 6, 8, 10, 13. The dependent claims are also allowable due to their dependency upon the independent claims having additional claimed features.

The closest patent to **Kim et al. (US 2003/0095,532 A1)** teaches the uplink channel UL-DPCH transmitted from user equipment UE (Fig. 3A), which has feedback field FBI 314 which contains control information for site selection diversity

Art Unit: 2618

transmission SSDT [0016, 0053], the channel quality indicator CQI [0017], the selecting of best primary cell [0008-0009], Kim fails to teach the detecting a case where no base station is transmitting to UE; inserting predetermined values into a received signal and decoding the predetermined values.

Other prior arts in below has been considered, but they fail to teach the above claimed features.

Futamura (US 5,910,947) teaches the base station does not receive the reply from master base station, due to another base station communicating with the identical master station, only transmit the "no sensing", sense value of 999 to mast station (col. 20, lines 20-35, col. 6, lines 45-65, abstract),

Kobayashi (US 6,721,564 B1) teaches the rake receiver 25 comprising 4 (fingers, Fig. 2, col. 8, lines 8-20), the microprocessor MPU 13 (Fig. 2, col. 43-49), the MPU 13 comprising measurement control means (col. 8, lines 42 to col. 9, line 10) assigning the at least one finger to demodulate the downlink signal, and determining that too little energy is present in the at least one finger that is assigned to demodulate the downlink signal (the step 3a, Fig. 3), for the mobile terminal to measure the receiving strength of pilot channel (step 3f; col. 9, line 60 to col. 10, line 15; col. 2, lines 31-67).

Childress et al. (US 5,175,866) teaches the trunking card cease attempting to communicate with the failed primary controller, by communicating with another site controller, to prevent the effect from a failure site controller (abstract, Fig. 6A-6E, Fig. 8, col. 14, line 58 to col. 15, line 22; col. 18, lines 32-56).

Riedle (US 2005/0039,205 A1) teaches the controller can setup a null value for the retire channel X [0048-0049], having later filing date 8/12/2003.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 5/5/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's argument for the no teachings, due to Suzuki is not teaching the detecting a case where no base station is transmitting to the UE; the inserting predetermined values into an output of a UE receiver [pages 6-8 of applicant's amendment, 5/5/2006],

Suzuki teaches the missing packet is detected in 802 of the received data at mobile telephone from server [Fig. 6/Fig. 17, abstract; server in paragraph 0002-0004], & the 802 detects the packet data is not received yet [paragraph 0066], which is equivalent to the detecting of no base station transmitting, due to no data received yet at mobile telephone.

Suzuki teaches the inserting the value "00" to data 8053 [Fig. 16], in front of the application decoder 209 via memory 207, [Fig. 17], such that the application decoder 209 can detect the error indication, without losing the synchronization [0078], which is equivalent to applicant's inserting of zero in front of the decoder 226 [applicant's Fig. 2], the output of UE receiver.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In

Art Unit: 2618

the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles C. Chow whose telephone number is (571) 272-7889. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:30pm.
- If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on (571) 272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.
- Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Charles Chow *C.C.*

June 23, 2006.


EDWARD F. URBAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000